REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application and are subject to Restriction and Election of Species requirements.

Claims 1-15 are amended to correct grammatical and typographical errors and to recite claims using language commonly used in U.S. practice. Claims 1 and 15 are amended to recite specific method steps. Support for the amendment to the claims may be founding the claims as originally filed.

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION AND ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENTS

Restriction Requirement

According to the Restriction requirement, claims 1-27 are not linked in such a way as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. Applicant is required to elect a single invention in accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, to which the claims must be restricted:

Group I, claims 1-14, drawn to a method of producing a hair fixing product and Group II, claims 15-27, drawn tot a hair-styling foil.

In response to the restriction requirement, Applicant hereby elects Group I, claims 1-14, drawn to a method of producing a hair-fixing product, without traverse. Applicant believes that the inclusion of claim 15 in Group II is in error because claim 15 recites a method as defined in claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that claim 15 be included in Group I and that claim 15 be examined together with claims 1-14.

Election of Species

According to the Election of Species requirement, the claims are directed to the following species, which are not so linked as to form a general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1:

- a) Polymer,
- b) Additional Hair-Fixing Polymer, and
- c) Surfactant.

Applicant is required to elect a single disclosed species for each of a)-c) above.

In response to the election of species requirement, Applicant elects: a) pullulan as the species of polymer, b) polyvinylpyrrolidone as species of additional hair-fixing polymer, and c) a mixture (blend) of cetyltrimethylammonium chloride with polyethylene glycol-40 as the species of surfactant. The election is made without traverse. Claims 1-15 are generic to the elected species.

Conclusion

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited. Should the Examiner have any comments or suggestions that might contribute to a compact prosecution of the application, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael J. Striker Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No.: 27233 103 East Neck Road

Huntington, New York 11743

631-549-4700